



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

we may ask if there was any object in enclosing the land. Why had not the official already done it himself?

But the word *ubih* rendered "enclosed" is common enough in the contracts, see Meissner, *ABP.*, p. 130, as a side form of *pāhu* "to exchange." We have already been told in the code that the reeve could not alienate any portion of his benefice. It is natural to expect that he could not exchange it either. If any one dares to make such an exchange of his own farm for the official estate of a reeve, the code provided a punishment for him. The word rendered "stakes" is plural *niplatim*. But no word meaning stake will serve as its singular. The word *niplu* seems to mean a shoot, a branch. It is hardly like to mean a fencing stake. But alongside of *pāhu* we find a synonym *pālu*, or *apālu*, see Meissner, *loc. cit.* Surely this gives *niplatim* at once as the thing offered or taken in exchange.

Hence I should render § 41 somewhat as follows: "If a man has exchanged the field, garden, or house, of a reeve, runner, or tributary, and has given an exchange, the reeve, runner, or tributary shall return to his field, garden, or house, and shall take for himself the exchange given him."

This is exactly parallel to the case of unlawful sale in § 35, where the buyer not only has to return his purchase, but also lose the price he paid for it.

C. H. W. JOHNS.

QUEENS' COLLEGE,
Cambridge.

EMENDATIONS IN THE TEXT OF EZEKIEL.

24:21.—A *crux interpretum* is the word מְחַמֵּל in Ezek. 24:21. The LXX reads καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν φεῖδονται αἱ ψυχὰς ὑμῶν; it is similarly explained in the new *Hebrew Lexicon*, "an object of your soul's compassion." Gesenius-Buhl *Lexicon* states that it is a word of unknown meaning. Bertholet, *in loco*, translates it "das Sehnen" = the longing; Kraetzschmar, *in loco*, renders it similarly, "das Verlangen." Both commentators are guided in their translations by the word מְחַמֵּד, which is found in some manuscripts. It occurs three times in Ezekiel, viz., 24:16, 21, 25. As, however, מְחַמֵּד occurs already once in this verse, the word מְחַמֵּל cannot have the same meaning. I explain it on the basis of the Aramaic root ܡܚܡܐ, of which the Afel pass. part. is ܡܚܡܐ = *collegit*. The meaning in both Peal and Paal is *θησαυρίζειν*. We read of a ܡܚܡܐ = *thesaurus*, Eph. Syr., in Ezek. 18:13; cf. Brockelmann, *Lex. Syr.* All the stems contain the meaning "to collect, to treasure up," hence מְחַמֵּל, regarding it as an Afel pass. part. of the root ܡܚܡܐ, signifies "that which has been treasured up," i. e., a treasure.

We find a goodly number of Aramaisms in Ezekiel, and as Aramaic was the *lingua franca* of the time (cf. 2 Kings 18:26), it certainly should not surprise us to find an Aramaic word in these prophecies, especially when the word seems to be a technical term. It is perhaps due to the

fact that **מִחְמֶל** was misunderstood by later copyists, who therefore inserted **ו** before **מִחְמֶל**. But this is not correct. In the first half of the verse Ezekiel is speaking of the sanctuary as the epitome of all that is desirable for a Yahweh-worshiper. In contrast to the Yahweh-worshiper stands the man (vs. 21*b*) who longs most of all for his sons and daughters. If **מִחְמֶל נָפַע** were an additional reference, the statements in vs. 21*a* and vs. 21*b* would not balance each other; therefore we must omit the **ו** before **מִחְמֶל** and regard **מִחְמֶל נָפַע** as an expression referring to the **מִקְדָּשׁ**. Then vs. 21*a* will read: “. . . . behold, I will profane my sanctuary, the pride of your strength, the desire of your eyes, the treasure of your soul.”

36:10-12.—A careful study of this passage has led me to the belief that **ש** is far from being correct. Vss. 10*a* and 12*a* are doubtless doublets. The **כָּל** of vs. 10*a* is a doublet of **כָּלָה**. For **אָדָם בֵּית־יִשְׂרָאֵל**, which is a very unusual expression, we must read, in accordance with vs. 12*a*, **אָדָם אֲחֵי־עַמִּי יִשְׂרָאֵל**. The **אֵת** was miswritten, was dropped. **עַמִּי**, which could not be explained in this connection, was dropped. **וְהוֹלֵכְתִּי** (vs. 12*a*) is corrupted out of **וְהִרְבֵּיתִי**. Vs. 12*a* is a doublet of vs. 10*a* in its original form. Vs. 11*a* β is omitted by LXX, but there can be no question that the whole of vs. 11*a* is an insertion by a later hand, as it separates vs. 10 from its natural sequence in vs. 11*b*. Read after **וְהִטַּבְתִּי** with LXX **ש**, Cornill, Toy, Kraetzschmar, **לָכֵן**. Vs. 12 belongs after **מֵרֵאשִׁיתֵיכֶם**. It is also necessary to read in vs. 12 **וְיִרְשׁוּכֶם** = “and they shall possess you,” *i. e.*, the plural pronoun instead of the singular; **וְהָיִיתִי** instead of **וְהָיִיתָ** and also **תֹּסִיפוּ**; *cf.* LXX. The mistake in the person is perhaps due to the fact that in the following verses the mountains are conceived of under the figure of a man-eater, while in vs. 12 the mountains are still addressed as such. According to these emendations vss. 10-12 read: “And I will multiply upon you men, my entire people Israel, and the towns shall be inhabited and the ruins shall be built up. (vs. 11) And I will cause you to be inhabited as in your former times, and I will do more good to you than in your earlier times. (vs. 12) And they shall possess you and ye shall be to them for an inheritance, and not shall ye bereave them again (*sc.* of their children), (vs. 11*b* γ) and ye shall know that I am Yahweh.”

37:19.—This verse as it stands offers a good many difficulties. What are we to do with the phrase **וְנָתַתִּי אוֹתָם עָלֶיךָ אֲחֵי־עַמִּי**? **וְנָתַתִּי אוֹתָם** refers without question to the **עֵץ** of Joseph, which is in the hand of Ephraim and the tribes of Israel and its associates. As **עֵץ** is singular we must read **אֹתוֹ**. **עָלֶיךָ** gives no sense in its present connection, and it seems to me to be a dittography of the original **עַל־עֵץ**, LXX $\epsilon\pi\iota\ \eta\gamma\alpha\rho\ \phi\upsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\nu$. These simple emendations give us a clear text. Ezekiel is not the pan-Israelite, as Kraetzschmar tries to make him out, but his point of view is more that of the Judahite. Judah shall have the leadership in this looked-for reorganization, therefore the scepter of Ephraim is placed in the hand of Judah, in whose hand the two scepters

shall become one. For בִּירֵי read after LXX, with Ewald, Toy, *et al.*, בִּירָי.

37:22.—The phrase בָּאֲרָץ בְּהָרֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל does not occur elsewhere in the Old Testament. "Mountains of Israel" is exclusively used by Ezekiel. It occurs in the following passages: 6:3; 33:28; 34:14; 36:1, 4, 8 (37:22); 38:8; 39:2, 4, 17, yet never in connection with בָּאֲרָץ. "Mountains of Israel" refers to the most conspicuous portion of the land of the Jews; as, however, בְּאֲרָצִי, according to LXX, precedes בְּהָרֵי, *i. e.*, the term designating the entire country precedes the reference to a portion of that country, it seems to me that בְּהָרֵי was added by a later hand, because the phrase "my land Israel" brought to his mind the familiar phrase of Ezekiel, "mountains of Israel," which he believed to have been omitted.

37:22 $\alpha\beta$.—The phrase לְכָלֵּם לְמִלְכָּה does not occur in LXX μ , and is therefore deleted by Cornill *et al.* Cornill, however, reads, with LXX B, לְהֵם. The emphasis in this whole paragraph (vss. 15 *sqq.*) is laid upon the fact that the northern kingdom and the southern kingdom shall become an indissoluble unit. Hence, over *all of these*, *i. e.*, Judah and its associates and Ephraim and its associates, shall reign one king. In view of this לְכָלֵּם must be retained, and the strong presumption is that לְמִלְכָּה is a dittography of לְכָלֵּם.

HANS H. SPOER.

JERUSALEM.

WHO WAS MELCHIZEDEK?—A SUGGESTED EMENDATION OF GEN. 14:18.

Historically, Melchizedek was king of Salem and priest of God Most High. Theologically, he was the great prototype of the Great High Priest, Jesus the Christ. This has been the accepted answer. Is another answer possible?

I. A suggested emendation.

In the word שָׁלֵם, Gen. 14:18, exchange sibilants, remove the upper stroke of the ש, and we have "Melchizedek, king of Sodom." The bargain between Abram and his allies or the custom of the time would determine whether the word בְּעֵשֶׂר, "tithe" (vs. 20), should be retained or omitted.

II. The reasons for making the emendation.

1. In the present state the story is disconnected. The king of Salem incident is felt to be an intrusion into the midst of the story of the king of Sodom and Abram. The connection is so loose that it almost seems like an interpolation. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 7:2, 3) felt something of this strangeness when he referred to Melchizedek as "being first, by interpretation, king of righteousness, and then also king of Salem, which is king of peace; without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, being made like unto the Son of God." Of course this very abruptness of introduction into the narrative only added to the supposed mysterious supernaturalism of the character of Melchizedek.